

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 12 and 14 – 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millington in view of King.

The Examiner acknowledges that Millington does not teach that the first and second functional areas display candidate and selected characters respectively and the display further comprises a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states. The Examiner asserts King to make up for this deficiency in the teaching of Millington. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the display in King comprises a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states. To support this proposition, the Examiner refers to column 25, lines 44 – 46 and Figure 12 of King.

However, the Examiner misapplies the teachings of King.

What King teaches is that:

"A keystroke window 1308 displays symbols corresponding to the individual keystrokes entered by the user in the order of entry. A keystroke window provides visual feedback to the user and also allows editing of the keystroke sequence."

Accordingly, what the Examiner construes to cover a stroke display area is, in fact, concerned with keystrokes. This is clearly visible with regard to Figure 12, as noted by the Examiner, where words or numbers are displayed. However, the claimed invention does not provide any stroke display area for displaying keystrokes. Rather, the stroke display area in the claimed invention is concerned with the strokes found in ideographic languages, such as Chinese. In this regard, the examiner is referred to, e.g. paragraphs

[0015], [0019], and [0036] in the specification of the application as originally filed, which concern stroke entry to form text symbols, *i.e.* ideograms.

In particular, starting with paragraph [0036] and continuing on page 9, Applicant teaches a variety of stroke categories. These stroke categories have nothing to do with the keystroke sequences taught by King. As such, King does not complete a teaching that would allow a person skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention, given the Examiner's acknowledged deficiencies in Millington's teaching. While Applicant is of the opinion that no further amendment to the claims is required to distinguish the invention from the Examiner's proposed combination, for purposes of expediency, Applicant has amended the independent claims to include more precise language directed to strokes of the type required by ideograph languages, to wit:

... a first cardinal state corresponding to a first stroke category, a second cardinal state corresponding to a second stroke category...

... wherein the first functional area displays candidate text symbols which comprise completed text symbols that have strokes associated with said first and second stroke categories...

... the display further comprises a stroke display area for displaying strokes within said first and second stroke categories, which are respectfully identifiable by the first and second cardinal states.

As can be seen from the Applicant's claim amendments, the invention is now clearly and unambiguously directed to a text symbol entry system that is concerned with strokes of the type found in ideographic languages, and not concerned with keystroke sequences as taught by King. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* showing of obviousness and the rejection is respectfully deemed traversed.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No 22,862